

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-13 remain pending in the present application. Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claims 1 and 8-10 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bednarchik (U.S. Pat. No. 6,427,465). Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 6 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 6 and Claim 6 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2, 5 and 9, which depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected, as Bednarchik discloses an air conditioning case (10) that defines an air passage through which air flows into a compartment (20 and 22). Claim 8 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 8 originally depended from Claim 1. Applicants have amended Claim 10 to include the limitations of Claim 8 which were found to be allowable. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 10, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 11, which depends from Claim 10,

is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bednarchik in view of Shibata (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0170707) and Takahashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,330,909). Claims 3, 4 and 7 ultimately depend from Claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 ultimately depend from Claim 10. As stated above, Claims 1 and 10 have been amended and are now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 3, 4, 7, 12 and 13 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 6 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, the limitations of Claim 6 have been incorporated into Claim 1 and Claim 6 has been cancelled.

Claim 8 depended from Claim 1. Claim 8 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of original Claim 1 and is thus believed to be allowable. The limitations of original Claim 8 have also been incorporated into independent Claim 10.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg